

E. SZEPES

AENEAS AT THE GATE OF THE NETHER WORLD

Before coming to discuss the descending of Aeneas to the nether world, we must recall that Aeneas is called by the ghost of his father Anchises in a night's dream to come to him. In general, history of literature holds this phenomenon also one of the parallel motives of one of Homer's passages, *viz.* Circe sends Odysseus to the nether world (Od. X), ranging it among the parallel structural and content elements between the Homeric epics and the Aeneis.¹ However, we can mention even two such examples, which not only formally resemble to this motive of the Aeneis, but agree with it in a much more essential point.² The first example is the drama of Aeschylus entitled *Persians*, where similarly the dead father foretells the future to his son. Thus, not only the family relations, but also the fact of the foretelling is nearer to the compositional method of the Aeneis. The other work, the motive of which is not only related to the scene of the Aeneis but also an archetype of it, is the *Somnium Scipionis* of Cicero, where the thoughts of Scipio Minor were occupied the whole day by his dead father, and thus his appearance in the dream of his son is a regular psychological phenomenon. In the same way the sphere of thought of Aeneas is occupied by the obsequies arranged in the memory of Anchises who had died one year before. Thus the psychological trick learnt from Cicero is used by Vergil in his work with justice. The dead Anchises, who prescribing the tasks to be performed by his son, with his speech taking place in a dream points towards the VIth Canto, where he outlines in the nether world all the future achievements of the whole Roman people in an elevated vision. In the dream the father advises his son to take the Cumaean Sibylla as his guide. Aeneas sailing towards Cumae visits the Apollo sanctuary of Delphi to ask for advice from the Sibylla. At first the prophetess draws up the future to Aeneas with the usual obscure pictures, then upon the definite questions of the hero she tells how he can get to the nether world. The series of events preceding the descent and offering already numerous problems, goes as far as this.

The first striking occurrence is that the Sibylla is characterized by Vergil with the words of Aeneas as follows (117–18):

...potes namque omnia, nec te
nequiquam lucis Hecate praefecit Avernis.

Thus the priestess of the Delphian Apollo was stationed by Hecate for the custody of the grove at the Avernian lake, viz. the goddess of Sibylla is Hecate. The most pregnant wording of the relation is given in these two lines, but clear hints are made also before, 9–13:

At pius Aeneas arces, quibus altus Apollo
praesidet, horrendaeque procul secreta Sibyllae
antrum immane petit, magnam cui mentem animumque
Delius inspirat vates, aperitque futura.
Iam subeunt Triviae lucos atque aurea tecta...

Beside Apollo's place of cult is the cave of his priestess Sibylla. There is not yet anything strange in this. However, direct beside this they saw the groves of Trivia. Trivia, as a goddess standing near to Apollo, could also be Diana becoming identical with Hecate, just as in the next passage that divine power appears under this name which can be either of the goddesses (35–36):

atque una Phoebi Triviaeque sacerdos...
Deiphobe Glauci...

Thus Sibylla is in the service of the goddess named Trivia and of Apollo. Aeneas will also offer sacrifices and set temples similarly to these two deities, if his wanderings will come to an end. The duality in the person of Trivia is abolished by the line already quoted above, viz.: *nequiquam lucis Hecate praefecit Avernis*...

We are faced with a strange cult, viz.: in the environment of lake Avernus the sanctuaries of Apollo and Hecate stand side by side, and Sibylla is the common priestess of the two. The strangeness of the cult consists in the fact that the Romans, but even the Greeks of the classical period, did not feel Hecate to be a deity standing near to Apollo. The female partner of Apollo is everywhere Artemis-Diana. The fact that in the cult at lake Avernus the arrowing goddess stands by no means on the side of Phoebus is shown not only by the usage of name — after all on account of the wide-spread Hecate-Artemis identification Diana was frequently called Trivia in Rome —, (in Lucretius even Iphigenia is sacrificed on the altar of Trivia in Aulis), but the main features of the goddess definitely to be called Hecate are also accurately differentiated and sharply outlined in the whole canto. And already two problems have been raised:

1) What commonness of cult is there in Cumae between Apollo and Hecate, and why is Sibylla the common priestess of them two?

2) How does Sibylla get to the entrance of the nether world, and then together with Aeneas to the nether world?

Let us take things one by one. The coming into existence of the commonness of cult of the two deities is analysed by Norden.³ The cult of Apollo *Ἀρχηγέτης* was taken by the Chalcidians led by a dove sent by Apollo from their native country to Cumae. The appearance of the name Deiphobe suggests that together with the cult of Apollo, the sea god Glaucus also came over here, whose prophesying talent was inherited by his daughter. The name Deiphobe was preserved in religious consciousness and passed to Sibylla who came over much later. This Deiphobe-Sibylla is the common priestess of Apollo and Hecate. Therefore it is presumed by Maas⁴ that the common cult had come already from Colchis. The idea of the common cult existing in advance is refuted by Norden with the fact that the places of cult are not situated directly side by side. In fact, Apollo resides on the castle hill of Cumae, while Sibylla goes there only to prophesy and dwells in the Hecate cave at lake Avernus. The location of her dwelling place was made on the basis of the line *Hecate praefecit lucis Avernus*, and this assumption is supported by line 211, where Aeneas takes the golden bough found at lake Avernus first to the *tecta Sibyllae*. Cocchia⁵ wants to solve the duality of Sibylla's dwelling place and oracle by presuming the existence of an underground passage between the two pints and the priestess would communicate through this tunnel between «her home and her working place». (The ironization was inspired by the ingenious — however not to be taken serious — proposition of Cocchia.) The difference in space of the two places of cult is not removed by the spanning of the distance, even if the communication takes place invisibly, in the underground. The conception of Norden, supported by data from antique authors, appears to be much more likely, than Cocchia's assertion unable to produce any proof. When the Colchians arrived in Cumae, they found here an ancient *μαρτεῖον χθόνιον* (Strab. 5,224, Liv. 24,12,4), which belonged to an old earth goddess, who on account of her nearness to the Avernus was identified by them Hecate, in consequence of her — that time already unambiguously — infernal character. Just because of the prophesying function of the goddess, she was brought by them into cultic community with the similarly prophesying Apollo coming with them, for whom however they built a new sanctuary.

Thus the formation of the cultic community of the two deities can be explained with their common sphere of action. However, the prophesying character of the goddess of the ancient *manteion chthonion* became already very dim in the Hecate image of the classical period, and only the belonging to the nether world was felt to be a quality characteristic of the goddess in the first place. Thus the relation of Sibylla, as a common priestess, to the prophesying god Apollo is obvious just by the ability of prophesying, but the belonging to Hecate requires still further explanation. Now the question can be raised, whether she is not only therefore the priestess of the goddess because Virgil, like a learned poet, wanted to revive in Hecate the prophesying ability dimmed already for a long time?

We must give an denying answer. The learned Vergil found two important possibilities of connection between Hecate and Sibylla, the first of which, the one known better, is that Sibylla herself has also to do with the nether world.⁶ This becomes clear especially when she is mentioned by Varro (quoted Lactantius, Div. Inst. 1,6) under the name Cimmeria. This Cimmeria has no relation with the wordly Cimmerians, this name belongs to a «small» or eventually a «gigantic» people, which according to Homer lives in eternal mist at the entrance of the nether world. It is the name of that people about which Strabo says that it prophesied future just in the neighbourhood of Cumae. Varro himself distinguishes this Cimmeria from the Sibylla living in Cumae, in whose realm is placed the scene of the VIth Canto and hereby the culminating point of the whole Aeneis too, where the past tense of the epic work shifts over to the future. This is predicted in Canto V by the mention of Sibylla. Otherwise, Cimmeria was identified also with another female figure with a prophesying talent, viz. the typically Italian Muse,⁷ Carmenta or Carmentis. This fact is important in the prophesying, future-showing tendency of the Aeneis from two points of view. On the one hand, it is just Euander, son of Carmenta, who is described by the epic first among the future heroes, and on the other hand, Carmenta herself prophesies about the future heroes. The reason for this can be explained in several ways, viz. either so that Vergil accepted the Carmenta-Sibylla identification, or he accepted Sibylla's priority in time as against Homer, even if not as a scientifically established thesis, but at any rate as a tradition which corresponded to his poetical plans. Finally, he knew the Sibylla-prophecies about Aeneas. Thus we can see that not only prophesying but also belonging to the nether world is associated with the character of Sibylla dominating the futurity of the Aeneis. And if we take into consideration that Pytho, the monster killed by Apollo, who originally had been the prophesying deity preceding Apollo,⁸ is serpentiform and that the serpent shape is the property of the earth spirit, which earth spirit has the power of prophesying, then the serpent shape becomes characteristic also of the prophesying demons. The infernal, funeral character of the prophesying demon Pytho is also shown by her name,⁹ viz. it is derived from the word *καταπύθειν* 'to rot'. The infernal, spiritual meaning of the serpent shape is analysed by Rohde in detail. Here we give only one more example, viz. Aeneas (Aen. 84-84 and 95) beholds a serpent coming forth:

... *adytis cum lubricus anguis ab imis*
septem ingens gyros, septem volumina traxit...

and he cannot decide what this phenomenon is:

incertus geniumne loci famulumne parentis
esse putet...

The deity of the Cumaean manteion chthonion could be, an infernal and prophesying earth spirit of similar character, and if we realize that the lethal existence is an essential condition of prophesying, and consequ-

ently the two concepts are closely interconnected — especially in the philosophy of the Aeneis adopting the Pythagorean metempsychosis, where the dead Anchises is just therefore able to show the future to Aeneas because its realizers are already living in the nether world, so Aeneas has to descend to the nether world just to find out the future —, then Norden's explanation regarding the connection of Hecate with this manteion chthonion becomes even more convincing. In the religion of the Romans, Hecate is in the first place an enchantress. However, the goddess of magic has also to do with prophesying, not only because the prerequisite of both function is the lethal community with the nether world, but also because a considerable part of the enchantments, especially the awakening of the dead, is done just for the sake of finding out the future. Thus for example in the Persae Atossa makes the spirit of the dead Darius to be conjured up in order to learn the fate of Xerxes, and Lucian's magician also asks for the consent and blessings of the deceased father marriage of a young couple. Therefore, it is logical that the infernal goddess supporting predicts has a priestess standing near to the nether world and having a talent for prophesying.

The second connecting link brings again to the surface an important ancient Hecate property forced under consciousness in the course of time. Sibylla leads Aeneas into the nether world just conjuring up Hecate and offering sacrifice to her. The descent to the nether world is compared by Norden with Lucian's Necyomantia,¹⁰ where upon the calling of Hecate by the enchantress a *σχιζμα* arises in the earth, from where the spirits come forth. According to Kerényi¹¹ the comparison is not fortunate from several points of view. On the one hand, because in Vergil's work the entrance is an already existing aperture, the *spelunca*. On the other hand, Norden is not correct also in saying that the sacrifice of Aeneas is at the same time also the magic opening the nether world, since in fact the *spelunca* is open. Kerényi feels that the passage of the (Orphic) Argonautica is much more obvious¹²:

...λέοντο δ' ὄχιη:
 κλειθρῶν ἀγρυγέων, ἀνὰ δ' ἔπτατο καλὰ θύρετρα
 τέλχος εὐρυμενὸς, ὑπεφαίνετο δ' ἄλσος ὀρυμνόν.

In this text Medea forces Hecate and her swarm with a sacrifice to come forth, for whom the gates open at the wall of the sacred grove, and thus the lovers can also enter. The picture is strikingly identical, viz.: the mouth of the cave opens to Hecate arriving there upon the prayer of Sibylla also with Vergil, and the goddess — not like with Lucian, where she comes up from the nether world together with the spirits — is staying about the entrance of the cave waiting to be able to enter. Thus we see that the open mouth of the cave is not yet enough for Aeneas to enter the cave. In fact, if it would be possible to enter, then why was it necessary to compel the goddess to? However, from the comparison of the two passages the rite is clear in the case of Medea as well as in that of Sibylla, viz.: one can enter the closed realm of the nether world only in the called up presence

of the goddess waiting *outside* the gate. (We find also another striking similarity between Medea and the Sibylla *viz.*: Medea puts the drake to sleep with her magic devices, just like Sibylla does it with Cerberus.) The Hecate of Kerényi's explanation is the direct continuation of that ancient deity concept, the first trace of which can be found in Miletos of Asia Minor. The name of the goddess can be read first on the bustrophedon inscription carved on the round altar in the sanctuary of the Delphinian Apollo in Miletos:¹³

.....
 Ἑόθρας
Λεωδάμας
 ὀνάξω ποντ (α)
 νεύοντες ἄ-
 νέθεκεν τῇκάτη

The text is the usual sacrificial offering; in itself it does not say anything. However, it is a much more important fact that the round altar stood in Apollo's sanctuary, because this means that the cults of Apollo and Hecate had been closely interconnected already in a very ancient time. We also have evidence to the effect that this connection was preserved for a long time in the Delphinian sanctuary. In the 1st century a certain Pausanias sets a round altar to Hecate.¹⁴ The law of the molpoi, which is originating from the 5th century B. C., and which is preserved in a copy originating from the 1st century, also points to the connection of their cults. Its original¹⁵ was dated by Nilsson¹⁶ to 448 B. C.:

καὶ ἄρχονται οἱ στεφανηφόροι Ταυρεῶνος θεῖον Ἀπόλλωνι Δελφινίῳ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀριστερῶν ἀποξάμενοι καὶ κορητοῖσας τ' σσασας. καὶ γυλλοὶ φέρονται δύο καὶ τίθεται παρ' Ἑκάτην τὴν πρόσθεν πολέων ἐστεμμένος καὶ ἀκρότης κατασπένδετε, ὁ δ' ἕτερος ἐς Δίδυμα ἐπὶ θύρας τίθεται. ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ἔρχονται τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν πλατεῖαν μέχρ' ἄκρο, ἀπ' ἄκρο δὲ διὰ δρυμὸς. καὶ παιωνίζεται πρῶτον παρ' Ἑκάτη τῇ πρόσθεν πολέων παρὰ Δονίμει...

Thus on the way to Didyma two gylloi have to be deposited, one them wreathed and sprinkled with unmixed wine παρ' Ἑκάτην τὴν πρόσθεν πολέων and the other at the gate at the end of the road leading to Didyma: ἐπὶ θύρας. During the depositing of the first one the first paean should be tuned up. About the paean we know that it is the most characteristic hymn to Apollo, and the fact that it is sung here to Hecate points to the close association of the cults. They are interconnected in the same way by the gylloi, because we have no data to the effects that they would have been offered also to other deities besides these two gods. Thus, we do not have to do with a sacrifice due to all gods. In Milet the denomination gylloi appears once again in a sacrificial calendar: they are offered (ἐστεθμένοι) also there to these two deities. Searching for the meaning of the word gyllos, we do not find it in this form in the ancient lexicons. Both «Suidas» and Hesychios know a gyllos, which was very

likely a military haversack. This, however, cannot have much to do with the Miletan cult. Rehm¹⁷ presumably relies upon this datum when he asserts that the *gylloi* have to be identified with the *gyllos*, and even if it does not mean a military haversack, at any rate it represents a basket filled with sacrificial gifts. However, Nilsson's assumption seems to be more correct. He relates the *gylloi* to Apollo's attribute *Aggieus*, and thus also with the *ἀγνιά*, the street itself. According to this assumption the *gylloi* are stone blocks and the stone block is originally Apollo. This assumption is supported by Nilsson with the stone cults very frequent in this region. He reminds us that the ancient hermaions were stone heaps, and the role of the pillar developed from the stone heap can be found all through in the Hermes cult. The stone heap dedicated to Hermes could be, on the one hand, a road mark, and on the other hand it could serve as an *apotropaion* to avoid the dangers lurking on the road. Similar pillars dedicated to Apollo can be found on a large number of coins found in Milet and its environment. These pillars were set up in front of the houses and served to protect them. Just like the pillar of Hermes consisted originally of stones, similarly the pillar dedicated to Apollo could also be originally a stone block. Nilsson attaches great importance to the fact that even the most ancient stones dedicated to Apollo were worked as contrasted with the naturalness of the stones dedicated to Hermes. Thus Harpocration:

Ἀγνιάς· ἀγνιεύς δέ ἐστι κίων εἰς ὃν λήγων, ὃν ἰσῆσαι πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν, ἰσίους δὲ αὐτούς φασιν εἶναι Ἑλλίου, οἱ δὲ Διονύσου, οἱ δὲ Ἀμφοῖν.

and Schol. in Aristoph. Vesp. 175:

πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἔθος εἶχος κίονας εἰς ὃν λήγοντας ὡς ὀβελίσκους ἰδρύειν εἰς τιμήν Ἀπόλλωνος ἀγνιεύς.

Nilsson does not mention, what can be the reason of the difference, although I feel that in this seemingly insignificant motif the differing characters of the two gods are expressed. In fact the hermaion is always placed on the road, on the earth not worked by human hand, while the pillar dedicated to Apollo stands always before the house created by man, more exactly before the gate of the house. (Hesychios:

Ἀγνιεύς· ὁ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἐστὼς βωμός ἐν σχήματα κίονος.

«Suidas» also knows it similarly:

ἀγνιά· εἶν δ' ἂν οἱ παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς λεγόμενοι ἀγνιεύς οἱ πρὸ τῶν οἰκιῶν βωμοί).

Hermes, therefore, is first of all the protector of the roads (later on, as the protector also of the urban roads, he becomes at the same time also the custodian of the houses of the city, and thus *προπύλαιος*²¹, but

essentially he is still a god walking on the roads, *viz.*: ἐρόδιος). Apollo, on the other hand, is a θύραϊος, gate protecting god, who has only that much to do with the road that he stands outside the house, on the road, but does not walk on it. W. F. Otto interprets both functions, the *thyraios* and the *agyeus* as functions of purificative character, because the god purifies the roads and the houses behind the gates from the ghosts. Thus he harmonizes also these two characters with the function of Apollo held by him to be the most important one, *viz.* the safeguarding of purity expressed also by the name Phoebus.²²

The stone pillar standing in front of the gate leads us back to Hecate, since in fact the *gyloi* have to be placed outside the gate also for her. Thus Hecate also gets into connection with the gate, but it seems that her function is not identical with that of Apollo. Apollo is *Thyraios*, gate protector, but there are noteworthy items of evidence to the effect that he not only defends the gate but he himself is also: a gate. Hrožny²³ in his famous paper, in the wordgroup ap-pa-li-u-na-aš of the Hittite texts written with hieroglyphs, believes to have discovered the god name Apulunaš of Asia Minor, and regards this as the prototype of the Greek Apollo. The idea is suggested to Hrožny already by the phonetic form, but the function of the pillars bearing the texts, *viz.* the gate protection, inspires him straight to derive the word from the Assyro-Babylonian word *abulu* 'gate'. Thus Apulunaš is a gate protecting god, according to Hrožny the gate itself, who in all probability can be identified with Apollo. Thus the function of Apollo as a gate can be followed from Babylon, through the Hittites, up to Milet. This supports the gate function of Hecate only inasmuch as if Apollo is a gate and Hecate appears together with him in the same cult, then it is likely that she is also a goddess of some related character. Already the rite of the placing of the *gyloi* itself clearly shows that the idea of being a gate is not of more recent origin with her either than with Apollo. This is shown also by the fact that in the inscription A. Col. V. published by Hrožny (also to be read on a stone block standing before a gate) there is an ideogram read by Hrožny as ^{dieu} He, and this is held by him the abbreviation of the ideogram Hepatu. Kraus²⁴ does not believe possible that the form Hecate could be traced back to this form, although on account of the existence of the agreement *p-k* among the certain Greek dialects, Barnett²⁵ regards the form Hecate the Lydian dialectal form of the name Hepat.

According to these Hecate is originally a gate goddess, but her character differs from that of Apollo. Apollo has one stone pillar in front of the house, for Hecate, two stone blocks have to be placed, *viz.* one before starting the journey, at the gate of the place of set-off, and another one on the arrival, at the gate there. I find the difference essential, *viz.* Apollo protects the house, while Hecate symbolizes: the place of the set-off and the place of arrival. This also indicates that the ancient Greeks distinguished between the protecting function and the function of letting through, or of the two worlds connecting-separating of the gate. And if, taking this into consideration, we can infer that Hecate's essential

character is the leading from one world into the other, then we can see in it the antecedents and the explanation of the later form of the goddess. Summing up the difference between the gate and the road functions of the Hermes-Apollo-Hecate, we can say that Hermes is the god of walking on the road (and only later the god of arrival or of the gate); Apollo, in front of the house gate, is the god standing on the road and protecting the house; while Hecate is the goddess of the character of the gate leading from the one world into the other, separating the one from the other.

The stone block placed before the gate has to be wreathed and has to be sprinkled with pure wine. This rite is brought by Eitrem²⁶ into connection with the evil-avoiding character of the gate and the threshold. The pure wine would point to an earlier blood sacrifice, in which the gate was sprinkled with blood for the sake of conciliation. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf²⁷ says that the function of the dog sacrifices, known in Milet and the Hellespontus from the 7th century, is similar to this rite. They are explained by Nilsson²⁸ with the fact that in the Greek conception the dog was worthless and despised animal and it was used exclusively as a conciliatory-purificative sacrifice. Nilsson does not hold the rite an impurity-transfer. I also arrived at the conclusion that the dog held to belong to the world of the dead — on account of its roaming among the dead — was felt to be somehow associated with the gate-Hecate leading to the other world and thus also to the beyond. The dog is the sacrificial animal of Hecate just because of the similarity between their characters. The free movement of the dog between the worlds of the living and the dead can be read in numerous myths. Part of the myths especially stress its infernal character, for example we can see the Egyptian Anubis on the one hand beside the dead body of Osiris: *puer* (i. e. Osiris) *per Cynocephalum invenitur* (Porphyrus: Div. Inst. Ep. 18. Brandt), and on the other hand he is the only one who ventures to approach the killed Apis, and he even eats of his body:

ἐπεὶ δὲ Καμβύσου τὸν Ἀπὶν ἀνελόντος καὶ θύσαντος, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνος ὁ κύων, ἀπώλεσε τὸ πρῶτος εἶναι καὶ μάλιστα τιμᾶσθαι τῶν ἐτέρων ζώων.

(Plut.: De Iside et Osiride 44.) However, even Plutarch himself does not know only the infernal side of Anubis, since he writes at the same place that the dog-Anubis is of double character:

καὶ γὰρ ὁ κύων χοῖται τῇ ὄψει νυκτός τε καὶ ἡμέρας ὁμοίως.

This is why his mother, Nephthys, who ἐστὶ τὸ ὑπὸ γῆν καὶ ἀφανές, shares him with her sister, Isis, because:

Ἰσις δὲ τὸ ὑπὲρ τῆν γῆν καὶ φανερόν.

This «amphibiousness» is felt also by Plutarch to be common exactly with Hecate:

ταύτην ἔχειν δοκεῖ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις τὴν δύναμιν ὁ Ἄνουβις, οἷαν ἡ Ἐκάτη παρ' Ἑλλήσι, χθόνιος ὢν ὁμοῦ καὶ Ὀλύμπιος.

Eusebius, on the other hand, knows about the identification with the other Greek god descending to the nether world and leading up from there and mentions this «semi-Greek» god by the name Hermanubis: Praep. evang. 3, 11, 43.) And as imagination has set a gate into the entrance of the nether world, frequently dog-shaped monsters are the custodians of these gates. Besides the Greek Cerberus we know also Egyptian cynocephalous demons, viz. in the interesting book of L. Kákosy²⁹ one of the gate-guarding demons of the nether world has the head of this animal on its anthropomorphic body and holds a key in its hand. The key as the symbol of the gate appears also in the cult of Hecate, who preserved also her gate-function surviving meanwhile in Asia Minor as a great goddess. Steuding in Aphrodisias pointed out a cult in which the priests are the priests *προπόλεως τῆς Ἐκάτης*.³⁰ Kraus³¹ describes a cult from Lagina in which two kinds of priestly offices are dedicated to Hecate, viz. the eunuchs, *σεμνώτατοι* take care of the sacred grove, while a few women perform the function of *κλειδοφόρος*. Hatzfeld³² holds this only a templekey holding and temple opening duty. To me, however, it seems to be more likely that here the key is the symbol of Hecate herself, of the gate. This is the more likely as in later periods Hecate herself is also addressed as key-bearer, viz. *παντὸς κόσμον κλειδοῦχον ἄνασσαν* in the first Orphic hymn dedicated to Hecate, and in the second Orphic hymn dedicated not without any lesson to Prothyraia, viz. *Προθυραία, κλειδοῦχ'*. The close sequence of the two goddesses also points to the not explicitly declared but clearly felt relationship of the two. Line No. 1395 of the famous magic papyrus No. IV from late antiquity gives this attribute already to Persephone, identified with Hecate, and what is even more exciting for us, in the same passage Anubis also appears as *κλειδοῦχος*. The gate, symbolized with its accessory, the key, is unambiguously the connecting – separating factor between the realms of life and death, and if from the Miletan rite we conclude the nature of Hecate as a wandering one between the two realms, then we can see that this ancient function is always hidden in the depth of the later Hecate conception, coloured though with many differing features. This is why she is accompanied all the time of the Greek religion by the dog as the animal most characteristic of her. This is why she becomes in the Homeric Demeter-hymn the goddess leading down to the nether world and bringing up from there in the kathodos and anodos of Kore. And finally this is why she becomes the mistress of the triodos, leading with one branch always to the nether world. So in all these places her most essential characteristic is that she stays only temporarily both in the nether world and on the earth, and usually she dwells about the gate separating the two worlds.

Kerényi, just in connection with the VIth Canto of the Aeneis, does not call this place of abode a gate but a wall³³, separating the living from the dead. It is also in itself a world of spirits, where the spirits are freely moving about. He demonstrates the wall-like conception of the border separating the two worlds on the basis of the Latin *Orcus* < *arceo* and on the basis of an Old Icelandic phrase. We, however (just on account of

a certain relation between the gate and the wall, but still holding the gate a closer conception), can apply also Kerényi's examples on the gate. The *Orcus-arceo* means in the first place keeping, and the fact the gate has an apotropaic role, has already been discussed by us in connection with Apollo Thyraios. Kerényi quotes also a Pausanias passage to prove the wall theory (Paus. 5, 20, 3):

λέγουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῇ (τῇ κλειδί) τὸν καλούμενον Ἀδην κεκλεισθαι τε ὑπὸ τοῦ Πλούτωνος καὶ ὡς ἐπάνεισιν οὐδείς αὐθις ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

But it requires no further argument to show that the gate, and not the wall, has to be opened with the key, and we have also discussed the gate-Hecate character of the key. In the Orphic Argonautica, mentioned by Kerényi as a passage resembling most to Vergil, also gates open upon the arrival of Hecate. Thus the goddess is waiting beside the separating border, in our opinion beside the gate. Upon calling she appears, but at her appearance the nether world does not open, thus she comes from outside just like those who called her. Her gradual approaching is announced by the louder and louder barking of the dogs. Thus Hecate called off from the border can be seen in the company of dogs before a journey to be undertaken from the upper world to the nether world:

...visaeque canes ululare per umbram
adventante Dea... (Verg. Aen. 6, 257)

The Sibylla conjured up Hecate for Aeneas to enter the nether world, and the entering of the three of them through the mouth of the cave raises one more problem. According to Norden the difference in the composition of the descent to the nether world and of the coming up from there is in the structure of the VIth Canto of the Aeneis contradictory. In fact, Aeneas gets to the threshold of the nether world in the way described above, viz. through the mouth of the cave. From here he gets farther only at midnight (535 ff.), when Sibylla tells that their paths will part. Norden interprets this statement that midnight is the time when the dead have to go up to the earth, and at the same time also the anabasis of the living has to take place. At this point we again have to support Kerényi's standpoint, according to whom the hour of spirits means for Aeneas that he can pass through the entrance of the nether world towards its interior. We try to prove our opinion with two statements: on the one hand, Aeneas goes only hereafter to Anchises and thus it is not at all the anabasis that follows, and on the other hand, Hecate, thus Sibylla personifying the characteristics of Hecate, can help only at the passing from the one world to the other. So the mistress of the nether world is not she but Persephone, what is also shown by the circumstance that the golden bough has to be given not to Hecate but to her. Thus the anodos of Aeneas does not take place in the hour of spirits, but only later. This going up is said by Norden to be contradictory, because Aeneas gets back to the earth through the dream crater, instead of going away through the same gate through which he had come. Kerényi solves the question saying that dream is the simplest way of passing from life to death and from death to life. He

brings it into connection with the apocalyptic visions, which always end with waking up. We accept this, but we also complete Kerényi's standpoint with an idea.

Not only therefore can Vergil choose the waking up from a dream as a way of the going up, because this is the simplest solution, but he could decide to insert this new element also from an aesthetic point of view. After all, if Aeneas ought to depart through the same gate, then he ought to walk through the whole nether world again, for example he ought to meet Dido again, etc. This would render the whole canto circumstantial and copious. The meeting again with Dido would definitely be disagreeable for Aeneas, and even if this solution would not deprive Vergil of the possibility to describe the dream crater and the Lethe — in fact he could have slightly touched them — it would deprive him of a beautiful homage to his master, Cicero, from whose work he could adopt not only the psychological motif mentioned above as perseveration of Aeneas is growing into a dream but also the moment of awakening from the dream, with which his favourite reading, the *Somnium Scipionis* comes to an end.

¹ G. N. Knauer: *Die Aeneis und Homer*. Göttingen 1964. *passim*, especially Chapter 2 (pp. 107–147).

² I. Trencsényi-Waldapfel: *Studii Classice* 3 (1961) 295.

³ E. Norden: P. Vergilius Maro *Aeneis* VI. Leipzig 1916. 117 foll.

⁴ E. Maas: *Commentarii Mythographici*. Greifswald 1886/7. XV. foll.

⁵ Quoted by Norden: *op. cit.* 120.

⁶ I. Trencsényi-Waldapfel: *Studii Classice* 3 (1961) *passim*, especially 292 foll.

⁷ I. Trencsényi-Waldapfel: *Mitológia*. Budapest 1956. 257.

⁸ E. Rohde: *Psyche*. I. Tübingen 1925. 133.

⁹ I. Trencsényi-Waldapfel: *Acta Orient. Hung.* 12 (1961) 202.

¹⁰ Norden: *op. cit.* 199.

¹¹ K. Kerényi: *Hermes* 66 (1931) 431.

¹² Orph. Arg. 985–87.

¹³ Th. Kraus: *Hekate*. Heidelberg 1960. 11.

¹⁴ Kraus: *op. cit.* 11 foll.

¹⁵ G. Kleiner: *Milet: Das Delphinion III*. Kawerau 1914. 129 and 133.

¹⁶ M. P. Nilsson: *Griechische Feste*. Leipzig 1906. 168.

¹⁷ Rehm quoted by Kraus: *op. cit.* 12.

¹⁸ M. P. Nilsson: *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. I. München 1941. 189.

¹⁹ M. W. de Visser: *Die nicht menschengestaltigen Götter der Griechen*. Leiden 1903. 66.

²⁰ de Visser: *op. cit.* 66.

²¹ Thuc. 6, 27.

²² W. F. Otto: *Die Götter Griechenlands*. Frankfurt 1956. 68 foll.

²³ B. Hrožný: *Archiv Orientalny* 8 (1936) 192.

²⁴ Kraus: *op. cit.* 55.

²⁵ R. D. Barnett: *The Aegean and the Near East*. Cambridge 1953. 220.

²⁶ S. Eitrem: *Opferitus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer*, quoted by Kraus: *op. cit.* 13.

²⁷ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf: *Der Glaube der Hellenen*. Basel–Stuttgart 1959. 165 foll.

²⁸ M. P. Nilsson: *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion*. I. München 1941. 95.

²⁹ L. Kákossy: *Varázslás az ókori Egyiptomban* (Magic Art in Ancient Egypt). Budapest 1969. fig. 8.

³⁰ Steudling quoted by Kraus: *op. cit.* 39.

³¹ Th. Kraus: *op. cit.* 39 foll.

³² Hatzfeld quoted by Kraus: *op. cit.* p. 51

³³ Kerényi: *op. cit.* 432.